

Richfield Dairy Supplemental Environmental Assessment  
Appendix of Comments

Section 1:

Comments of Dana Lynn Hanaman, Esquire.  
Comments of Kestrel Management Services, LLC by Thomas P. Kunes, P.E.  
Comments of Pleasant Lake Management District by Jean MacCubbin, President  
Comments of Ms. Francie Rowe  
Comments of Sierra Club—John Muir Chapter by Shahla M. Werner  
Comments of Kenneth S. Wade, P.E., P.G..  
Comments of Ray J. White, Ph. D..  
Comments of McGillivray Westerberg & Bender LLC by Christa Westerberg, Esquire  
Comments of George J. Kraft, Ph.D., P.H.  
Comments of Michael Best & Friedrich LLP by David A. Crass, Esquire

**Section 2:**

**Additional Comments**

Section 3:

Additional Comments



# RIVER ALLIANCE of Wisconsin

January 7, 2013

Ms. Rachel Greve

Wisconsin Dept. of Natural Resources

P.O. Box 7921

Madison, WI 53707

Dear Ms. Greve:

Please accept our comments and observations for the record concerning the application for a high-capacity well permit by Milk Source LLC for its proposed Richfield Dairy site in eastern Adams County, and your agency's development of an Environmental Assessment (EA).

The DNR was asked by a Dane County Circuit Judge to revisit a previously prepared EA that did not adequately consider the impacts of a well pumping 132 million gallons per year (mgy). Richfield Dairy subsequently requested a permit for 72.5 mgy. DNR then prepared a supplemental EA, and it is to this document that our comments are directed.

## 1. Cumulative Impacts

Our biggest concern with the supplemental EA is its casual dismissal of how the Richfield Dairy's 72.5 mgy of pumping might add to the cumulative (read negative) impacts to Pleasant Lake and other surface waters in the proposed dairy's vicinity. The agency acknowledges cumulative impacts are real, e.g. "...any additional water withdrawal in the area will increase existing stresses on . . . groundwater supply to surface water bodies..."

The EA then says, "DNR has evaluated these cumulative effects for the purposes of the EA, in order to perform its decision-making regarding the [Richfield Dairy] proposal." But rather than presenting any data or findings to solidify its earlier observation that cumulative impacts are "real," DNR simply lists "resources used" for its evaluation and comes to the conclusion that, even with acknowledging cumulative effects on surface waters by groundwater pumping, it is "limited" to reviewing only the wells on the "high-capacity property." Here the DNR cites no state or federal statutory or administrative limitations or proscriptions on assessing cumulative impacts or limiting its review to the property in question. Given DNR's Public Trust authority, it seems a grave oversight on the agency's part to simply punt this away in the case of Richfield Dairy.

From a common-sense point of view, it is the equivalent of DNR's point source regulators saying they can't regulate PCB deposits found in Green Bay coming from a paper mill in Kaukauna because their authority is limited, to paraphrase the agency's formulation in this case, "to the polluting property." Most disturbingly, that statement implies that the two high-capacity wells on

*We Save Rivers*

Milk Source's "high capacity property" are simply two pipes extending straight down into some underground tanks that no connection to the surrounding aquifer.

At some point, amidst the 2,000 + high-capacity wells in the Central Sands area, there has to be developed a science-based understanding of which well is "the last straw" for a particular groundwater-shed – the point at which one or three more wells tips the balance from sustainable to unsustainable water use. In this case, it may or may not be Richfield Dairy. But Richfield's wells will be pumping 24/7/365 (unlike the extant irrigation wells). Given the paltry attention DNR has given to cumulative effects of all these wells in this instance, the supplemental EA falls way short -- not only in giving not even cursory review to cumulative effects, but also failing to make a reasonable case for whatever analytical or regulatory limitations prevents the agency from doing so.

We urge the DNR to give cumulative effects of Richfield's and the other 90 wells in the vicinity of Pleasant Lake the serious consideration and analysis it deserves. It can be the analytical template for what needs to be applied all over the Central Sands where deleterious surface water drawdown from groundwater pumping is already obvious.

## **2. Permit Conditions**

DNR spells out a handful of conditions for Richfield Dairy's permit. One glaring omission from this proposed set of conditions is that DNR will not require that any request by the permittee to increase its pumping capacity be made public. The sleight-of-hand attempted by Richfield Dairy in recent months regarding its water needs is rather transparent: if asking for 130 mgd gets too much scrutiny, they ask for half that to jump an easier regulatory hurdle. Given that Richfield's wells will have the capacity to pump 525 mgd, it is reasonable to assume they will be back asking for more capacity soon after operations begin (as they did at their New Chester Dairy).

We urge the DNR to make as a condition of this permit – should a permit ever be granted -- that the agency will make public any request by Richfield Dairy for a higher pumping rate as long as this facility is in business.

## **3. Pleasant Lake Water Levels**

In reading what data the EA relied on for analyzing pumping effects by Richfield Dairy on Pleasant Lake, it summarized the lake's fluctuating levels over the decades as "historic variation."

We know that others will challenge the agency's analysis of that lake's changing levels. We would only point out that the more significant decrease in Pleasant Lake's levels have occurred in the past decade or so, coincident, it seems, with the increased groundwater pumping by the nearby high-capacity wells. A more thorough EA that didn't write off those varying water levels as "typical" or "historic" would examine just how much water had been removed from the aquifer that feeds Pleasant Lake by all the wells in its vicinity. This would help determine cumulative impacts of current and additional high-capacity wells – impacts the agency seems to wish away.

#### 4. "Significant"

The entire premise of the Richfield Dairy supplemental EA is that no ecological impacts of its pumping 72.5 mgd will be "significant: -- on Pleasant Lake, an adjacent wetland, springs, and nearby creeks.

Yet nowhere in the EA is "significant" defined for any of these water bodies. The EA reads as if these impacts would not be "significant" because DNR analysts feel that they won't, without any scientific or analytic support, or definition of "significant" for any of the possibly affected water bodies.

#### 5. Stream Impacts

DNR's analysis on the impacts on creeks Little Roche a Cri, Fordham, Chafee, and Tagatz is odd. It uses as its basis of analysis stream gauges rather than at the headwaters, which would be a more accurate "telling" of groundwater pumping on overall stream health. It relies on a method found in the "SSPA model," which takes us to our final comment.

#### 6. Sources of Data and Analysis

We understand that the Dept. of Natural Resources is significantly understaffed to provide the kind of analysis necessary or desirable for these complex environmental issues. We appreciate that the DNR has to rely on data gathered and supplied by other scientists. In the case of Richfield Dairy, however, we find it discomfiting that "SSPA" -- S.S. Papadopoulos and Associates -- seems to be the dominant source of data collection and analysis that DNR draws on for its EA. SSPA was, of course, hired by Milk Source LLC to provide this data as part of its permit application. While DNR refers to research conducted by Prof. George Kraft and others in the EA, it is apparent that SSPA's work -- work provided by a private contractor on behalf of a permit applicant -- got higher priority and more weight than did science provided by a public employee who works in the area and whose professional and academic focus and specialty has been the hydrology of the Central Sands.

We appreciate your consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,



Denny Caneff

Executive Director



# **JULIE LASSA**

## **STATE SENATOR**

January 7, 2013

Rachel Greve, DG/5  
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources,  
101 S Webster Street  
P.O. Box 7921,  
Madison, WI 53707-7921

Dear Ms. Greve,

I am writing to urge the DNR to give careful consideration to the comments of my constituents in response to the Richfield Dairy Supplemental Environmental Assessment published in November. Although the assessment finds that the wells on the Richfield Dairy property "are not likely to cause significant adverse environmental impacts," the assessment itself documents the cumulative impact of the 90 high-capacity wells located within four miles of the proposed wells.

According to the assessment, current high-capacity pumping in the vicinity creates a substantial drawdown of base groundwater flow for local surface waters – in excess of 10 percent in five of the waters listed, and as much as 40 percent at one. In addition to the water lost to pumping, persistent drought conditions have also stressed the water supply in area lakes, rivers and creeks. New high capacity wells in this location will contribute to these trends and increase the potential threat to wildlife habitat, recreational use and property values along these waterways.

Further, while the estimates in the assessment are based on the applicant's stated intention to pump 72.5 million gallons of water annually, the proposed wells themselves have the capacity to pump more than seven times that amount; were they to do so, the impact on local surface waters would be devastating. A number of my constituents have expressed justifiable concerns about the impact of the new wells if they were ever permitted to operate close to their capacity.

The sensitive geology of the Central Sands region and the competing demands for groundwater make it crucial that DNR exercise caution in regulating wells in the region. The agency should listen carefully to the input of area residents, and I urge you to do so as you evaluate the Richfield Dairy well permit.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Julie Lassa".

JULIE LASSA  
State Senator  
24<sup>th</sup> Senate District

**From:** [Anxious12@aol.com](mailto:Anxious12@aol.com)  
**To:** [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)  
**Subject:** (no subject)  
**Date:** Sunday, January 06, 2013 5:19:11 PM

---

TO ALLOW ADDITIONAL HIGH CAPACITY WELLS AND NOT LOOK AT CUMULATIVE FUTURE IMPACT AND FUTURE ONES IS CRIMINAL. THIS COULD CAUSE A PERMANENT DRAW DOWN OF PLEASANT LAKE OF AROUND TWO FEET. IT WOULD ONLY BE A MATTER OF TIME AND PLEASANT LAKE AND OTHER SURROUDINGS LAKES, RIVERS, WETLANDS, ETC COULD BE DRIED UP. THE DNR NEEDS TO BE AWARE OF THIS AND EXPLAIN HOW THESE WELLS WOULD NOT HAVE A "SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT" EVEN THOUGH THEY HAVE APPROVED 7 NEW WELLS WITH PUMPING CAPACITIES GREATER THAN 70 GPM WITHIN 5 MILES OF THE PROPOSED RICHFIEL DAIRY. THEY MUST NOT ALLOW THESE ADDITIONAL WELLS TO PROTECT WHAT HAS BEEN THERE FOR MANY YEARS.

CINDY MASON  
PLEASANT LAKE  
N110 AND N123 CZECH DRIVE  
COLOMA, WI

**From:** [Emily Hein](#)  
**To:** [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)  
**Subject:** Concern: High Capacity Wells in Central Sands  
**Date:** Monday, January 07, 2013 1:36:57 PM

---

Dear Ms. Greve,

I am writing to express my deep concern regarding the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy. Our family has had a small cottage on Pleasant Lake for 4 generations and we are starting to fear this will be our last due to ongoing water level issues, which could be greatly mitigated with the help of the DNR. I am also concerned the impact the wells will have on nearby Little Roche a Cri Creek, Fordham Creek, Chaffee Creek, and Tagatz Creek.

Pleasant Lake has been experiencing very low water levels for several consecutive years, most likely as a result of the many high capacity wells in the Central Sands. Studies have shown impact to these waters at the original pumping request of 52 MGY and yet the DNR states that no *significant* impact would occur based on a higher amount of 72 MGY. In light of all other evidence, and the combination of the many other wells in the area, *significant* is a matter of interpretation. As an individual property owner who enjoys the use of these waters, these impacts are, in fact, significant!

While the DNR acknowledges the impact to these areas due to the large number of high capacity wells already in existence, the agency's position of ignoring these cumulative impacts is one of profound disappointment. As a proponent for Natural Resources (as is in your agency's name), it is deeply concerning and brings into question your agency's support – or lack therefore – of Wisconsin's most valued resources. I urge the DNR to more thoroughly address cumulative impacts: this region is located in the middle of highly intensive irrigated agriculture. Studies have shown that high-capacity wells in the region have led to reductions in water quantity in the Central Sands region of the state. I urge the DNR to deny the application for high capacity well(s) based on probable significant adverse environmental impacts to waters of the state that cannot be avoided by placing conditions on the construction or use of the well(s). At the very least, limits should be set and consideration for the people and animals of the region, not solely the pockets of the businesses wishing to operate.

Without sustainable water levels in Pleasant Lake and area waters, we are at risk of diminishing wild life, as well as our own properties upon these waters. Not only will our property values be impacted, but memories and happy lives are as well at stake as the water line continues to creep several feet farther away from the previous year's water line. Please remember us in your agency's ongoing review of this very important cause.

Sincerely,

Emily K. Hein  
414-282-1122 (H)  
414-732-0296 (C)



**From:** [Kenneth Turner](#)  
**To:** [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)  
**Subject:** DNR evaluation of Richfield project  
**Date:** Sunday, January 06, 2013 1:06:58 PM

---

I am happy to provide these comments in regard to the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy. I feel an Environmental Impact Statement, EIS, is in order for several reasons:

- 1) There are many creeks, streams, and waters of the United States that will be impacted. Little Roche, Fordham, Chaffee, and others are all navigable, used by thousands for recreation, and valuable resources for the region. The impact of these high-capacity wells on these waters of the US as a valued commodity of the region is something that the EIS will determine.
- 2) Pleasant Lake, as its name implies, is another regional asset. Its value in terms of quality of life as well as its economic benefit to the entire region is enormous. Further study of the impact of these high-capacity wells is absolutely required! You cannot endanger a community's economic well-being without showing some other economic justification- and an Environmental Impact Statement is the governmentally required avenue for that justification.  
Pleasant Lake has experienced very low water levels, even previous to the recent drought. Studies have shown that there are impacts on Pleasant Lake even at the rate of 52 MGY; the current request is for even higher pumping levels! As the Department of Natural Resources is aware of the impacts at the lower levels, an Environmental Impact Statement is required.
- 3) There are already documented impacts on the wetlands northwest of the proposed high-capacity wells. Again, the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources is legally required to determine the nature and severity of the impact, the possibility of decreasing the impact, the possible justification of the impact in terms of economic opportunity, etc. This is precisely the set of conditions that mandate an Environmental Impact Statement.

It is plainly shown that, at minimum, an Environmental Impact Statement must be required for this project. The project should be halted pending the outcome of this EIS. Anything less would be considered dereliction of duty by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources.

Ken Turner

Frequent Wisconsin Tourist! (bringing Illinois dollars to Wisconsin communities....)

And a stone's throw from Wisconsin-literally

415 Park

Warren, IL 61087

815-745-9013

**From:** [chris.gusloff](#)  
**To:** [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)  
**Subject:** Fw: Fwd: Property owner-residents' oppositional comments to supp. EA (dated 11/12) re Richfield CAFO's 72.5 HightCapWells permit application  
**Date:** Monday, January 07, 2013 12:29:22 PM

---

Dear Ms. Grave,

My family has been coming up to Pleasant Lake for over 60 years. My grandparents started a great tradition and 4 generations later, we are still going strong. My parents met at this lake, and since then, our families have since purchased 5 homes around the lake. WE DO NOT WANT THIS TO END due to deteriorated lake levels.

As a long time owner for over 60 years, I would like it on the record that my family is in full support of the comments made below. I am forwarding the email to you as to spare you from re- reading my " personalized version".

I hope you consider the impact these wells will have on Pleasant Lake. The lake levels are low right now, the wells will destroy it!

Please confirm back.

Sincerely,

Chris Gusloff  
N268 3rd lane.  
Coloma, Wi.

Sent from Yahoo! Mail on Android

---

**From:** DLH <manyrivers@gmail.com>;  
**To:** <gooseloff@sbcglobal.net>;  
**Subject:** Fwd: Property owner-residents' oppositional comments to supp. EA (dated 11/12) re Richfield CAFO's 72.5 HightCapWells permit application  
**Sent:** Mon, Jan 7, 2013 5:14:37 PM

No problem, Chris... yes, please see below and fw some of this w/ your edits before 4pm today!!  
anything helps!

Yes, Milk Source will start pushing hard now...so BEWARE...we need to get ready for the BIG fight now! It is SO WRONG that not only are they only required to pay \$125/yr for 400+ gallons of water (v. a muni well water family paying sometimes over 4x that here!), BUT WE'RE ALSO SUBSIDIZING THIS CRAP (via tax and dairy subsidies from OUR taxes)?? NO WAY, NO MORE...plz let everyone you know, know this BS is going on ALL over WI!

People just have no clue.  
Dana Lynn Hanaman, Esq.  
715-498-7155 (Mobile)

**From:** [Suzan Jardine](#)  
**To:** [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)  
**Subject:** Fw: Needing your help for Fish Lake  
**Date:** Monday, January 07, 2013 6:07:34 AM

---

Ms. Greve,

I want to express my deep concern regarding the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy.

I am specifically concerned with the impact the wells will have on Little Roche a Cri Creek, Fordham Creek, Chaffee Creek, and Tagatz Creek as well as Pleasant Lake. I am troubled by the potential impact to Little Roche a Cri and Fordham Creeks which are both Exceptional Resource Waters, and Chaffee and Tagatz Creeks which are Outstanding Resource Waters. The wells also will have a detrimental effect on Pleasant Lake which has already been experiencing very low water levels for several consecutive years most likely as a result of the many high capacity wells in the Central Sands. The impact to the wetlands NW of the site is also of concern.

Studies have shown impact to these waters at the original pumping request of 52 MGY and yet the DNR states that no *significant* impact would occur based on a higher amount of 72 MGY. This is not logical. In light of all other evidence, and in combination of the many other wells in the area, *significant* is a matter of interpretation. As an individual who enjoys the use of these waters, these impacts are in fact significant!

While the DNR acknowledges the impact to these areas due to the large number of high capacity wells already in existence, the agency's position of ignoring these cumulative impacts is one of profound disappointment. I urge the DNR to more thoroughly address cumulative impacts; this region is located in the middle of highly intensive irrigated agriculture. Studies have shown that high-capacity wells in the region have led to reductions in water quantity in the Central Sands region of the state.

I urge the DNR to deny the application for high capacity well(s) based on probable significant adverse environmental impacts to waters of the state that cannot be avoided by placing conditions on the construction or use of the well(s).

Sincerely,

Suzan Jardine



**From:** [James Friedrich](#)  
**To:** [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)  
**Cc:** [jclarke@furstgroup.com](mailto:jclarke@furstgroup.com); [Scott Froehlke](#)  
**Subject:** Fw: Richfield Dairy CAFO wells  
**Date:** Monday, January 07, 2013 7:58:06 AM

---

A clarification Rachel...

Regarding my reference to working "in this area", I refer to the geographical area. I worked in residuals regulation and management, with a broad array of industrial and municipal entities. I had oversight of their landspreading activities, which requires knowledge of associated water and soil resources.

**From:** [James Friedrich](#)  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 06, 2013 9:22 AM  
**To:** [Rachel.Greve@wisconsin.gov](mailto:Rachel.Greve@wisconsin.gov)  
**Cc:** [jclarke@furstgroup.com](mailto:jclarke@furstgroup.com) ; [Scott Froehlke](#)  
**Subject:** Richfield Dairy CAFO wells

I am writing regarding the high-cap wells proposed for the Richfield Dairy CAFO. I worked for WDNR **in this area** for 16 years and have good grasp of the situation and the resource.

Given the vast pumping already taking place in the Wisconsin central sands area, and that we are currently in serious drought, the ***cumulative impact*** of the Richfield CAFO wells needs to be considered. This how WDNR plans to evaluate the proposed Golden Sands CAFO wells in the Town of Saratoga, and the situation is very similar for the Richfield CAFO. There are already many water resources adversely impacted in the central sands area, and acknowledged experts (such as George Kraft from UW-Stevens Point) recognize the fallacy of studying these wells individually, rather than in total.

For WDNR to ignore the cumulative impact of the combined well pumping defies both science and common sense. The primary mission of WDNR is to protect the resource, not to grease the wheels of ill conceived ag industry.

Jim Friedrich  
Retired WDNR Wastewater Specialist/Residuals Regulator  
Wisconsin Rapids Service Center

**From:** [suzipe@aol.com](mailto:suzipe@aol.com)  
**To:** [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Needing your help for Fish Lake  
**Date:** Monday, January 07, 2013 7:24:16 AM

---

Ms. Greve, I want to express my deep concern regarding the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy. I am specifically concerned with the impact the wells will have on Little Roche a Cri Creek, Fordham Creek, Chaffee Creek, and Tagatz Creek as well as Pleasant Lake. I am troubled by the potential impact to Little Roche a Cri and Fordham Creeks which are both Exceptional Resource Waters, and Chaffee and Tagatz Creeks which are Outstanding Resource Waters. The wells also will have a detrimental effect on Pleasant Lake which has already been experiencing very low water levels for several consecutive years most likely as a result of the many high capacity wells in the Central Sands. The impact to the wetlands NW of the site is also of concern. Studies have shown impact to these waters at the original pumping request of 52 MGY and yet the DNR states that no significant impact would occur based on a higher amount of 72 MGY. This is not logical. In light of all other evidence, and in combination of the many other wells in the area, significant is a matter of interpretation. As an individual who enjoys the use of these waters, these impacts are in fact significant! While the DNR acknowledges the impact to these areas due to the large number of high capacity wells already in existence, the agency's position of ignoring these cumulative impacts is one of profound disappointment. I urge the DNR to more thoroughly address cumulative impacts; this region is located in the middle of highly intensive irrigated agriculture. Studies have shown that high-capacity wells in the region have led to reductions in water quantity in the Central Sands region of the state. I urge the DNR to deny the application for high capacity well(s) based on probable significant adverse environmental impacts to waters of the state that cannot be avoided by placing conditions on the construction or use of the well(s). Sincerely,

--

""As long as man continues to see the world in terms of 'we' and 'they', war is inevitable. Until we realize that 'we' are a part of 'them', peace is not possible."  
Jim Parker 1944 - 1991

**From:** [Daniel Hoerchler](#)  
**To:** [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Richfield dairy permit  
**Date:** Sunday, January 06, 2013 11:54:58 AM

---

Ms. Greve,

I want to express my deep concern regarding the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy.

I am specifically concerned with the impact the wells will have on Little Roche a Cri Creek, Fordham Creek, Chaffee Creek, and Tagatz Creek as well as Pleasant Lake. I am troubled by the potential impact to Little Roche a Cri and Fordham Creeks which are both Exceptional Resource Waters, and Chaffee and Tagatz Creeks which are Outstanding Resource Waters. The wells also will have a detrimental effect on Pleasant Lake which has already been experiencing very low water levels for several consecutive years most likely as a result of the many high capacity wells in the Central Sands. The impact to the wetlands NW of the site is also of concern.

Studies have shown impact to these waters at the original pumping request of 52 MGY and yet the DNR states that no **significant** impact would occur based on a higher amount of 72 MGY. This is not logical. In light of all other evidence, and in combination of the many other wells in the area, **significant** is a matter of interpretation. As an individual who enjoys the use of these waters, these impacts are in fact significant!

While the DNR acknowledges the impact to these areas due to the large number of high capacity wells already in existence, the agency's position of ignoring these cumulative impacts is one of profound disappointment. I urge the DNR to more thoroughly address cumulative impacts; this region is located in the middle of highly intensive irrigated agriculture. Studies have shown that high-capacity wells in the region have led to reductions in water quantity in the Central Sands region of the state.

I urge the DNR to deny the application for high capacity well(s) based on probable significant adverse environmental impacts to waters of the state that cannot be avoided by placing conditions on the construction or use of the well(s).

Sincerely,

Daniel Hoerchler

Pleasant Lake

W13371 Czech Drive

Coloma, WI 54930

[815-761-7015](tel:815-761-7015)



**From:** [Laurel Delaney](#)  
**To:** [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)  
**Subject:** Help for Fish Lake  
**Date:** Sunday, January 06, 2013 11:04:53 PM

---

Dear Ms. Greve,

I have been considering purchasing property in the area of Fish Lake in Hancock Wisconsin. I have delayed due to constant rumors and observable effects on the lake of water management practices in the area. I have a number of friends in the area who are property owners and who have passed along the following information to me. Wisconsin is so beautiful and I have always thought that as a state Wisconsin has always proudly maintained and watched over it's most cherished resources of waterways and forests. This area's ecological bio-diversity could suffer greatly from the proposed high-capacity wells. I would like to speak out for a return to more sustainable production in both agriculture and dairy farming. The following information details the specifics of our concerns about the Richfield Dairy high-capacity wells. Thank you for your consideration. Best Regards, Laurel Delaney

I want to express my deep concern regarding the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy.

I am specifically concerned with the impact the wells will have on Little Roche a Cri Creek, Fordham Creek, Chaffee Creek, and Tagatz Creek as well as Pleasant Lake. I am troubled by the potential impact to Little Roche a Cri and Fordham Creeks which are both Exceptional Resource Waters, and Chaffee and Tagatz Creeks which are Outstanding Resource Waters. The wells also will have a detrimental effect on Pleasant Lake which has already been experiencing very low water levels for several consecutive years most likely as a result of the many high capacity wells in the Central Sands. The impact to the wetlands NW of the site is also of concern.

Studies have shown impact to these waters at the original pumping request of 52 MGY and yet the DNR states that no *significant* impact would occur based on a higher amount of 72 MGY. This is not logical. In light of all other evidence, and in combination of the many other wells in the area, *significant* is a matter of interpretation. As an individual who enjoys the use of these waters, these impacts are in fact significant!

While the DNR acknowledges the impact to these areas due to the large number of high capacity wells already in existence, the agency's position of ignoring these cumulative impacts is one of profound disappointment. I urge the DNR to more thoroughly address cumulative impacts; this region is located in the middle of highly intensive irrigated agriculture. Studies have shown that high-capacity wells in the region have led to reductions in water quantity in the Central Sands region of the state.

I urge the DNR to deny the application for high capacity well(s) based on probable significant adverse environmental impacts to waters of the state that cannot be avoided by placing conditions on the construction or use of the well(s).

Sincerely,

Laurel Delaney



**From:** [Mike & Fran Geier](#)  
**To:** [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)  
**Subject:** Hi Cap wells in the Central sands plain  
**Date:** Monday, January 07, 2013 9:57:21 AM

---

Ms. Greve;

My name is Michael Geier and I am the President of the Waushara County Watershed Lakes Council, Inc. (WCWLCI). This organization is made up of lake groups and concerned citizens in Waushara County who's goal is to protect, preserve and restore the waters of Waushara County. This job has been made increasingly difficult since 2000 with High Capacity Wells popping up everywhere in the Central Sands Plain. This area is being threatened yearly more and more with more hi-cap wells being approved daily by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR). Just last year the WDNR permitted 51 new hi-cap wells in Waushara County and 36 hi-cap wells in Portage County. In 2011, the Wisconsin Supreme Court placed the WDNR in charge of all surface and groundwater in Wisconsin and since then the WDNR has become, "The Kids in the Candy Store". Since 1998, five lakes Waushara County have dried up and several other lakes in Waushara County are now threatened and are drying up. The only factor in this area that has changed reference water usage is the number of hi-cap wells being installed for irrigation systems and now CAFO's. Waushara County is losing tax base and tourism dollars yearly. The WCWLCI strongly supports the efforts to block the construction of the Richfield Dairy near Pleasant Lake in Waushara County and we strongly encourage the WDNR to designate the Central Sands Plain as a Water Management Area. This will give the WDNR the time they will need to study the water usage in this area. The waters of Waushara County need your support and we need it NOW. Ms. Greve, come to this area to actually see what is taking place. The WDNR MUST look at these well permits and the overall effect they are having in this region. Waushara County needs its lakes, rivers and streams to generate revenue, there really isn't any other businesses here. Waushara County is known for its lakes, rivers and streams and right now the WDNR is destroying the Central Sands Plain and Waushara County.

Sincerely,

Michael Geier, President  
Waushara County Watershed lakes Council, Inc.

From: [Alistair Stewart](#)  
To: [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)  
Subject: High Cap Well for Richfield CAFO  
Date: Sunday, January 06, 2013 8:26:15 PM

---

I want to express my deep concern regarding the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy. I am specifically concerned with the impact the wells will have on Little Roche a Creek, Fordham Creek, Chaffee Creek, and Tagatz Creek as well as Pleasant Lake. I am troubled by the potential impact to Little Roche a Creek and Fordham Creeks which are both Exceptional Resource Waters, and Chaffee and Tagatz Creeks which are Outstanding Resource Waters. The wells also will have a detrimental effect on Pleasant Lake has already been experiencing very low water levels for several consecutive years most likely as a result of the many high capacity wells in the Central Sands. The impact to the wetlands NW of the site is also of concern. Studies have shown impact to these waters at the original pumping request of 52 MGY and yet the DNR states that no **significant** impact would occur based on a higher amount of 72 MGY. In light of all other evidence, and in combination of the many other wells in the area, **significant** is a matter of interpretation. As an individual property owner who enjoys the use of these waters, these impacts are in fact significant!

While the DNR acknowledges the impact to these areas due to the large number of high capacity wells already in existence, the agency's position of ignoring these cumulative impacts is one of profound disappointment. I urge the DNR to more thoroughly address cumulative impacts; this region is located in the middle of highly intensive irrigated agriculture. Studies have shown that high-capacity wells in the region have led to reductions in water quantity in the Central Sands region of the state. I urge the DNR to deny the application for high capacity well(s) based on probable significant adverse environmental impacts to waters of the state that cannot be avoided by placing conditions on the construction or use of the well(s).

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [Chris Irvin](#)  
**To:** [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)  
**Subject:** High Capacity Well for the Richfield Dairy  
**Date:** Monday, January 07, 2013 6:21:00 PM

---

Ms Greve,

I am writing to express my concern for the Richfield Dairy's proposed high-capacity wells. I am particularly concerned with the impact the wells will have on Little Roche a Cri Creek, Fordham Creek, Chaffee Creek, and Tagatz Creek as well as Pleasant Lake. The potential impact to Little Roche a Cri and Fordham Creeks, which are both Exceptional Resource Waters, and Chaffee and Tagatz Creeks, which are Outstanding Resource Waters. The wells also will have a detrimental effect on Pleasant Lake, which is showing visible water level decreases already. The impact to the wetlands NW of the site is also of concern. Studies show the impact to these waters at the original pumping request of 52 MGY and yet the DNR states that *no significant* impact would occur based on a higher amount of 72 MGY. This "oversight" defies all logic. In light of all other evidence, and in combination with the many other wells in the area, "*no significant*" impact is a matter of interpretation. I recreate in and enjoy these waters, so as a part-time resident these impacts are very significant!

While the DNR acknowledges the impact to these waters due to the large number of high capacity wells already in existence, the agency's position of ignoring these cumulative impacts is very concerning and disappointing. I urge the DNR to more thoroughly address cumulative impacts; this region is located in the middle of highly intensive irrigated agriculture. Studies have shown that high-capacity wells in the region have led to reductions in water quantity in the Central Sands region of the state. I strongly urge the DNR to deny the application for high capacity well(s) based on probable significant adverse environmental impacts to waters of the state that cannot be avoided by placing conditions on the construction or use of the well(s).

Thank you for the opportunity to share my concerns.

--

Thanks

Chris Irvin, REHS

Sandpoint, Idaho (Coloma, Wisconsin)

**From:** [Paul Triezenberg](#)  
**To:** [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)  
**Cc:** [suzanne.triezenberg](#)  
**Subject:** High Capacity Wells Adverse Affects  
**Date:** Sunday, January 06, 2013 9:00:05 PM

---

I

want to express my deep concern regarding the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy. I am specifically concerned with the impact the wells will have on Little Roche aCri Creek, Fordham Creek, Chaffee Creek, and Tagatz Creek as well as Pleasant Lake. I am troubled by the potential impact to Little Roche a Cri and FordhamCreeks which are both Exceptional Resource Waters, and Chaffee and TagatzCreeks which are Outstanding Resource Waters. The wells also will have a detrimental effect on Pleasant Lake has already been experiencing very low water levels for several consecutive years most likely as a result of the many high capacity wells in the Central Sands. The impact to the wetlands NW of the site is also of concern. Studies have shown impact to these waters at the original pumping request of 52 MGY and yet the DNR states that no *significant* impact would occur based on a higher amount of 72 MGY. In light of all other evidence, and in combination of the many other wells in the area, *significant* is a matter of interpretation. As an individual property owner who enjoys the use of these waters, these impacts are in fact significant! We have experienced lower water levels on Pleasant for the last fours years. We experience issues with our piers and boat lifts. There are also issues with using the boat launch due to the decreasing water levels.

While the DNR acknowledges the impact to these areas due to the large number of high capacity wells already in existence, the agency's position of ignoring these cumulative impacts is one of profound disappointment. I urge the DNR to more thoroughly address cumulative impacts; this region is located in the middle of highly intensive irrigated agriculture. Studies have shown that high-capacity wells in the region have led to reductions in water quantity in the Central Sands region of the state. I urge the DNR to deny the application for high capacity well(s) based on probable significant adverse environmental impacts to waters of the state that cannot be avoided by placing conditions on the construction or use of the well(s).

Respectfully Submitted,

Paul Triezenberg

**From:** [John Kinsman](#)  
**To:** [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)  
**Subject:** High capacity wells -Richfield Dairy  
**Date:** Monday, January 07, 2013 10:17:58 PM

---

I was a certified well pump installer. I saw what a new school in an area did to the ground water level. Neighbors had to drill new wells to reach groundwater. Pleasant Lake and the streams in the area are showing significant drop in water levels. Richfield Dairy by itself should not have a another high capacity well permit because of what it is doing to surface waters and ground water levels. When it is in the area of other high capacity wells, it will have disastrous effects on water levels. I recommend that you deny the Richfield Dairy a permit for another high capacity well.

John G. Kinsman, E2940 Hwy K, LaValle, WI 53941.



**From:** [Jack Fahs](#)  
**To:** [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)  
**Subject:** High Capacity Wells Richfield Dairy  
**Date:** Sunday, January 06, 2013 3:56:48 PM

---

Dear Rachel Greve, I am writing to voice my opinion about the high capacity wells being considered for the Richfield Dairy project. I always thought the DNR was set up to protect our natural resources, not to give them away to individuals for cattle confinements or dairy farms. I have property on Lake Burnita (just south of Pleasant Lake) and the water is so low the past 6 or 7 years our children and grandchildren haven't even been able to go swimming there, let alone even put our dock in. This area has gone to a lot more irrigators the past few years adding much to our problem I'm sure, even though the DNR refuses to believe it. I feel everyone connected with the DNR should be required to drive the area and see what our lakes look like ((spring fed)and talk with the adjoining land owners for their opinions . Our little lake Burnita has a meeting once a year to pay dues and discuss what has occurred during the past year. Several years ago we invited a DNR to be a guest speaker for us. He informed us no uncertain terms that we better not disc or even mow our beaches as that would be bad for the wild life. I didn't realize the DNR has the power to tell you that you can not even mow your own property. OK, so now it's up to you folks to stop this insane idea about allowing multiple wells before you dry up our lakes and completely ruin the property values which are already on the skids. SINCERELY, J. Fahs

**From:** [maurenquin@comcast.net](mailto:maurenquin@comcast.net)  
**To:** [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)  
**Subject:** High Capacity Wells  
**Date:** Sunday, January 06, 2013 4:24:03 PM

---

Ms. Greve

I am writing this email to express my concern over the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy. I am worried about the impact the wells will have. The wells proposed would impact Little Roche aCri Creek, Fordham Creek, Chaffee Creek, Tagatz Creed and Pleasant lake. The impact to the wetlands NW of the site is also a worry. As the DNR states that no significant impact would occur based on higher pumping I feel that it would be significant. I am hoping the DNR considers denying the application for high capacity wells based on the adverse environmental impacts to our waters and placing conditions on the construction or use of wells.

Maureen Quinn  
Pleasant Lake  
Coloma, WI

**From:** [James L. Packard](#)  
**To:** [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)  
**Subject:** High Capacity Wells  
**Date:** Sunday, January 06, 2013 10:32:03 AM

---

Dear Ms. Greve,

I am writing to express my concern with the continued support the DNR has shown and continues to show regarding the addition of high capacity wells in the area of Pleasant lake in Waushara county. Our family has owned property on Pleasant Lake for over 60 years, and I presently own a home on the lake that is just six years old. Our lake is five feet below its normal level and continues to go down with the additional wells approved by the DNR. Pleasant Lake is not a dammed up stream. No water runs into or out of the lake. All the water is supplied by underground springs and water from the aquifers in the area. Additional wells will make an already bad situation worse, and will turn our lake into a grass filled valley if something isn't done to stop the uncontrolled pumping of water from the aquifer. Any amount of additional pumping will cause even greater damage to the aquifer, and lower the lakes in the area. *There are a number of case across the United States where over pumping of the aquifers have completely depleted the aquifers.* I am sure there are some right here in Wisconsin. Read the case studies, and look at the real facts.

I have some difficulty understanding how the DNR can just over look clear and simple facts, that clearly show that over pumping of an aquifer can cause them to go dry. I also don't understand how the DNR can deny this is in fact the case in the center sands area of Wisconsin, and particular in the Pleasant Lake area. I realize there is considerable pressure on the DNR to approve anything that will in other peoples words "bring jobs, and commerce to the state", and while I support more jobs, and commerce for Wisconsin I do not support it at the cost to others, or to our natural resources.

I don't want to become a part of the radical groups that over play everything that anyone does to our land and resources, but the continued lack of the DNR to act on real facts continues to lead me in a direction that the very principal of the situation warrants greater expense, then the result of the action will cost.

I strongly encourage you and the top level management of the DNR to focus very seriously on this situation, and realize that you cannot approve in additional high capacity wells, period!! in the central sands area. I will continue to follow your actions closely, and hope you determine that there is a real issue here, and that additional wells can't be allowed.

Thanks,

James L. Packard

**From:** [Connor Quinn](#)  
**To:** [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)  
**Subject:** High Capacity Wells  
**Date:** Sunday, January 06, 2013 4:39:16 PM

---

Ms. Greve

I am writing this email to express my concern over the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy. I am worried about the impact the wells will have. The wells proposed would impact Little Roche aCri Creek, Fordham Creek, Chaffee Creek, Tagatz Creed and Pleasant lake. The impact to the wetlands NW of the site is also a worry. As the DNR states that no significant impact would occur based on higher pumping I feel that it would be significant. I am hoping the DNR considers denying the application for high capacity wells based on the adverse envirnomentaI impacts to our waters and placing conditions on the construction or use of wells.

Connor Quinn

Pleasant Lake  
Coloma, WI

**From:** [thomas quinn](#)  
**To:** [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)  
**Subject:** High Capacity Wells  
**Date:** Sunday, January 06, 2013 4:50:10 PM

---

Ms. Greve

I am writing this email to express my concern over the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy. I am worried about the impact the wells will have. The wells proposed would impact Little Roche aCri Creek, Fordham Creek, Chaffee Creek, Tagatz Creed and Pleasant lake. The impact to the wetlands NW of the site is also a worry. As the DNR states that no significant impact would occur based on higher pumping I feel that it would be significant. I am hoping the DNR considers denying the application for high capacity wells based on the adverse envirnomentaI impacts to our waters and placing conditions on the construction or use of wells.

TJ Quinn

Pleasant Lake  
Coloma, WI

**From:** [Quinn, Brennan J](#)  
**To:** [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)  
**Subject:** High Capacity Wells  
**Date:** Sunday, January 06, 2013 4:27:45 PM

---

Ms. Greve

I am writing this email to express my concern over the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy. I am worried about the impact the wells will have. The wells proposed would impact Little Roche aCri Creek, Fordham Creek, Chaffee Creek, Tagatz Creed and Pleasant lake. The impact to the wetlands NW of the site is also a worry. As the DNR states that no significant impact would occur based on higher pumping I feel that it would be significant. I am hoping the DNR considers denying the application for high capacity wells based on the adverse environmental impacts to our waters and placing conditions on the construction or use of wells.

Brennan Quinn  
Pleasant Lake  
Coloma, WI

From: [Chris](#)  
To: [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)  
Date: Wednesday, January 09, 2013 6:31:49 PM

---

I want to express my deep concern regarding the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy. I am specifically concerned with the impact the wells will have on Little Roche a Cri Creek, Fordham Creek, Chaffee Creek, and Tagatz Creek as well as Pleasant Lake. I am troubled by the potential impact to Little Roche a Cri and Fordham Creeks which are both Exceptional Resource Waters, and Chaffee and Tagatz Creeks which are Outstanding Resource Waters. The wells also will have a detrimental effect on Pleasant Lake has already been experiencing very low water levels for several consecutive years most likely as a result of the many high capacity wells in the Central Sands. The impact to the wetlands NW of the site is also of concern. Studies have shown impact to these waters at the original pumping request of 52 MGY and yet the DNR states that no *significant* impact would occur based on a higher amount of 72 MGY. In light of all other evidence, and in combination of the many other wells in the area, *significant* is a matter of interpretation. As an individual property owner who enjoys the use of these waters, these impacts are in fact significant!

While the DNR acknowledges the impact to these areas due to the large number of high capacity wells already in existence, the agency's position of ignoring these cumulative impacts is one of profound disappointment. I urge the DNR to more thoroughly address cumulative impacts; this region is located in the middle of highly intensive irrigated agriculture. Studies have shown that high-capacity wells in the region have led to reductions in water quantity in the Central Sands region of the state. I urge the DNR to deny the application for high capacity well(s) based on probable significant adverse environmental impacts to waters of the state that cannot be avoided by placing conditions on the construction or use of the well(s).

*We live about a mile from the site and DO NOT want to have to deal with the smell, impact on my well and pollution. The value of my land and home will go down significantly...*

*Please return to common sense and preserve our area from greedy business owners. Our quality of life is important too.....*

Conrad and Christine Wasielewski  
W13380 Cty Rd CC  
Coloma

**From:** [Henry Meresz](#)  
**To:** [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)  
**Subject:** Permit for High Capacity Wells for the Richfield Diary  
**Date:** Sunday, January 06, 2013 8:44:11 PM

---

I write to express my concern regarding the proposed high capacity wells for the Richfield Diary. I am concerned about the impact these wells will have on existing residential wells. I live in the area of Central Sands about 1.25 miles from the proposed Richfield Diary site, and the aquifer here is already highly stressed by substantial number of irrigation wells. Adding additional wells will only aggravate the situation. Adjacent creeks and lakes, specifically, Little Roche aCri Creek, Fordham Creek, Chaffee Creek Tagatz Creek, Pleasant and Wood Lakes may also be affected. I had serious misgivings about the original Environmental Assessment. In my view it was inaccurate as it did not address the concerns of the numerous permanent residents like myself living within about a 1 - 2 mile radius of the proposed site of the Richfield Diary. The Supplemental Environmental Assessment in spite of substantial technical details does not change my mind. In view of the foregoing I urge you to either refuse the permit for these wells or recommend an Environmental Impact Statement.

Very truly yours  
Henry Meresz



**From:** [John D. Garnett](#)  
**To:** [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)  
**Subject:** Property owner-residents" oppositional comments to supp. EA (dated 11/12) re Richfield CAFO's 72.5 HightCapWells permit application  
**Date:** Monday, January 07, 2013 8:35:38 PM  
**Importance:** High

---

Dear Ms Greve:

I am hereby writing, to you to express our extreme dissatisfaction with the DNR's faulty, biased, non-thorough and/or incomplete environmental review process in this supposed supplemental environmental assessment, still to date, continuing after the CAFO's sudden new application, and its pending improper permitting of this detrimental CAFO. This new supplemental EA adds very little additional evidence of review and analysis than the original EA released 5/31/11, which is now moot, due to a Superior Court Judge Markson's over-rule of the original EA found lacking.

We, as long-time Pleasant Lake property owners, share grave concerns (along with MANY other neighbors) over the now, very clearly, scientifically and concretely-documented significant harm and threats to the precious and pristine seepage Pleasant Lake upon which we live and recreate. We have continued to express these concerns and backed them up with scientific proof, but the DNR continues to outright REFUSE to analyze or acknowledge this CAFO's significant negative impact on Pleasant Lake, despite the July 2011 WI Supreme Court ruling in Buelah mandating DNR's duty to consider significant, negative impacts to surface waters by groundwater withdrawals, and despite the DNR itself acknowledging the CAFO's high cap wells' pumping as yet ANOTHER of many negative cumulative causation pumping impacts of over 400 mgd directly within 5 miles of Pleasant Lake. Pleasant Lake has an extremely public groundwater aquifer-dependent water quantity level, which has now been shown, via multiple scientific hydrogeology reports (already cited and submitted to the DNR\*\*, see below), to suffer, in particular, a very large future drawn down by this CAFO's proposed very proximate siting in Richfield, less than 2.5 miles away.

You, the DNR, readily admit in this Supp. EA that: "Modeling by Kraft and Mechenich (2010) shows an average water table drawdown of 1.5 feet at Pleasant Lake;...in last 10 years, ...within 5 miles of the proposed Richfield Dairy,...(alone, you have already freely permitted) SIX...agricultural irrigation wells with pump capacities of 400-1200 gpm; ... it is expected that similar increases in groundwater withdrawal could continue in the future, (and finally, that) the addition of the Richfield Dairy wells, or any additional water withdrawal in the area, will increase existing stresses on the availability of groundwater to supply surface water bodies. However, when DNR determines whether or not to approve an application for a high capacity well, DNR is limited to considering whether the proposed well or wells on the high capacity property may cause significant adverse environmental impacts." (p. 6-7 of Supp. EA) . In addition, your Supp. EA states you actually consider Wade/Krafts cumulative reports "to inform your decision making", yet in the very next paragraph, you claim you CAN'T consider them, that you are "limited" to only analyzing the proposed well(s)/application. Is this because you really know you should be taking into consideration the cumulative reports.

We would like to know where this invoked "limitation" came from, and/or how the DNR,

particularly post-Buelah, via DOJ, has come to assert such BOGUS, politically-motivated "limitation?" For the DNR to outright refuse to consider and review "cumulative impacts" in reviewing high cap well permits, utterly eviscerates ANY ability and DUTY of the DNR to actually do its legal, statutory job, and serve and act as steward of the public trust. In that the majority of ground and surface waters are connected and do not operate in a vacuum of environmental individualism, such unsubstantiated declaration by the DNR that it may "not" consider this CAFO's application in conjunction with actual reality, and the reality of interconnected nearby negative impacts, is absolutely absurd, irrational, and/or a clear and patent abuse of discretion, given the DNR's very clear duty of environmental protection of public trust natural resources. This is especially the case and reality here, of this CAFO's super-groundwater-pumping's significant negative environmental impact on Pleasant Lake that at present only averages, by DNR's own admission, 15 feet in depth. Pleasant Lake is hardly a renewable public water resource, yet the DNR has specifically chosen, via its questionable, disingenuous, self-imposed "limited" internal environmental review policies, to do nothing to protect it, thereby flouting its WI constitutional duties. The DNR's liability is clear, in that it has utterly abused its discretion in pronouncing now, via this deficient supplemental EA, that the CAFO's high cap wells, while still seeking to be permitted at 72.5 mgd, will have no significant negative environmental impact on Pleasant Lake. In that regard, this supp. EA is, yet again, deficient and demonstrates that the DNR continues to choose to disregard public surface waters it is held to protect, failing to act legally, under governing common and statutory law, to properly assess, review and permit high cap wells.

We urge the DNR to do its job fully and properly, re-consider its deficient review, and thoroughly consider its cumulative/associated potentially harmful impacts to protect public waters of the state as is the DNR's duty, according to the recent Lake Buelah Supreme Court precedent, such that it does not abuse its discretion. We join in all comments to date and hereinafter submitted by the PLMD and/or Frances Rowe in relation to any of the Richfield CAFO's applications, in addition to these comments. Further, we also hereby formally bring our concerns to the greater attention of our state legislative representatives, including those in whose districts this CAFO is soliciting to operate (specifically, in the Richfield Township of Adams County), and request that they immediately also take action in terms of ensuring the safeguard of nearby private residential wells and highly threatened, extremely valuable nearby public waters like Pleasant Lake, which generate much tourism economic dollars and recreation opportunities (swimming, boating, fishing, hunting) in their districts which are irreplaceable. It is all of your responsibilities to ensure that local public waters, particularly those most immediately threatened by the proposed CAFO site, like Pleasant Lake, are not harmed.

If you allow Pleasant Lake to be severely drawn down by the illegal permitting of yet another 6K+ cow Milk Source CAFO, much like the other horrible one already operating just 10 miles to the South which has already destroyed the adjacent public surface water of Patrick Lake and local Grand Marsh area, there is no getting Pleasant Lake back. It will be impossible to reverse or turn back the devastation of this CAFO if it is allowed to be improperly sited in Richfield to our detriment. Please address these concerns and respond in writing. We continue NOT to be dissuaded and intend to do whatever is legally necessary to defeat this, yet another, irresponsible, uncaring, mega-corporation, attempting to illegally take over and destroy our precious natural resources and waters without even any financial liability, and only ridiculously being required to pay \$125/year for such extreme water use. We will continue to fight to protect Pleasant Lake, but also

the whole surrounding WI Central Sands area from the expanding, irresponsible, deregulated, DNR-rubber stamped, "Open for Business" development which most certainly doesn't benefit WI residential property owners and individuals, but rather only benefits the big corporate farms in question. We will NOT allow these mega-agriculture operations to continue to rape and pillage our precious natural resources like Pleasant Lake for FREE, and even more atrociously, via our public subsidy that they have most definitely stolen from us.

As long-standing resident, tax-paying, law-abiding, property-owning Wisconsin citizens within 2.5 miles of this proposed factory farm CAFO, we are thoroughly disturbed by its ominousness. Our families have long recreated and lived on Pleasant Lake and want, intend and have the RIGHT to do so for many generations to come. We have matured together here, seen our children grow up together swimming, skiing, diving, sailing, fishing and even working (right on the Lake) here, and continue to drink and depend on our clean private well waters to sustain ourselves.

Very unfortunately, we have already witnessed and directly experienced the horrible effects of a severely lowered Pleasant Lake level, not being able to swim off or ski from around our piers because the water is already too shallow now. When I was young, being under five feet, I could not stand whatsoever at the end of our pier; now, I am lucky if the water comes up to my knee, DESPITE having extended our pier much farther out into the Lake many years ago due to the ever lower Lake. Each year we have to keep extending our pier further so that our pontoon boat is not resting on the sand, and we have some water to wade in, at least.

Therefore, this supp. EA is deficient and the DNR must do something MORE to prevent the loss of this precious public water altogether (due to continued, unregulated high cap well permitting and operation which has and continues to lower and dry up lakes and streams), including specifically, reversing its unsubstantiated finding of "no significant adverse impact", performance of an EIS, and the denial of this high cap well permit for this devastating CAFO less than 2.5 miles away. Given the acknowledged average depth of only 15 feet of Pleasant Lake, it is abundantly clear that an average draw down of 1.5 feet, to be caused in heavy part by this CAFO's high cap well permitting, will completely decimate it.

There is no question about the continued lower Pleasant Lake levels to come, that will occur, in grand part, as a result of any permitting of this CAFO, as documented. This means: silt on the beaches from boats stirring up the bottom due to shallow water, disruption of the fishery due to boats running over the sand point in shallow water where bluegills nest, NO Lake whatsoever to look at from our house as we have for years as long as I can remember/every year of my life, no friends visiting/staying as they have at the Lake for years, and sunsets that are no longer over any water. Lowered or absent lake levels mean limited continued swimming, no paddleboating, no pontooning with friends, and no further Lake recreating in general, because no motorized crafts nor us as humans, will be able to proceed through low water or water that is not there. This Richfield CAFO EQUALS lowered Pleasant Lake levels, if not the all out drying up of Pleasant Lake, which in turns means total loss of recreation, enjoyment here, not to mention the plummeting of our private property values, which the DNR and Milk Source would be jointly responsible for, and whom we would hold liable. Protection of this immediate public water is the duty of the DNR, and therefore, it can NOT legally permit the high cap well's this CAFO seeks in Richfield. By allowing the CAFO wells to proceed, and this supp. EA to stand as is, the

DNR will directly allow the further devastation of Pleasant Lake's water quantity, not to mention quality, and the all-out ruining of the whole pristine area's clean, rural green space, recreational opportunities in the surrounding 3 mile radius, due to the awful 6000+ cows' manure stench (with nothing preventing 3000+ more cows in future years), heavy load traffic noise and pollution, and overall development that WILL necessarily occur.

I, and my immediate family and neighbors, feel very alienated/ignored, disrespected/disregarded and disturbed/disappointed by the DNR EA's clearly erroneous and unsubstantiated claims of "no harm" and "no impact" to the public waters very close by the proposed CAFO livestock factory (particularly Pleasant Lake, where we live and work). We are also quite abhorred at the incomplete review by the DNR of Milk Source's application, and expect the DNR to (1) DENY its permit application, or in the very least (2) mandate alternate, more natural resource-protecting and responsible re-siting of this CAFO deeper West into Adams County, and/or (3) now complete the EIS which should have begun a long time ago as required (under WEPA/DNR standards of "significant impact(s)" and/or unique, never before considered conditions/circumstances (i.e. the Central sandy, pourous soil topography of the area).

At present, the DNR's EA is severely lacking in the area of the immediate surrounding waters' quantity and quality protection, evidencing glaring omissions in its summary conclusions. Any and all other additional requirements necessary to achieve and MAINTAIN water quantity protection standards for Pleasant Lake, in particular, under the public trust doctrine, should be analyzed, and in the very least, set as conditions to any permits. The groundwater maps being relied upon in the DNR's analysis are now over 30 years old and a DNR representative him/herself has acknowledged that these maps/modelling can no longer be accurate given the addition of 800+ high capacity wells in Waushara County alone since then, and because of ever-changing groundwater flows and other geological boundaries and drawdowns in the vicinity surrounding the proposed CAFO.

An EIS must be completed/documented to assure that the DNR's environmental cumulative impacts review is reflective and consistent with WEPA as required, including consideration of the "(cumulative) impacts of repeated actions of this same type" because they "can (EASILY) be anticipated" in Adams County with effects extending necessarily to the immediate adjacent Waushara County, particularly 2.5 miles SouthEast into Waushara where Pleasant Lake is located, as the presently proposed CAFO site is located precisely on this county line. NR 150.22(2)a(2). The DNR is required to base its analyses on up-to-date information and accurate, long term modelling, and especially because these have now been provided by respected scientists, they must do so, or their any permitting of this CAFO will be illegal and met with further intense and unflattering litigation.

The DNR is Wisconsin's environmental resource steward and is obligated to protect public waters (especially from big business' pollution and lack of accountability for their destruction). If the DNR refuses to be the steward of natural resources, as is its mission, WHO will be? and WHAT, pray tell, has this State and its supposed "democratic government" come to?? Where is the environmental pre-tax on these corporations that only want to take, and take, and take?? They instead get tax-BREAKS and a free pass because they certainly can't re-fill a Lake now will or can they?

We appreciate your thorough review and incorporation of these oppositional comments in

a timely fashion and your continued improved review process. Ultimately, we request that you DENY this CAFO's permits altogether, or in the very least deny permitting now at this site (and mandate a different one) due to the extreme potential well-documented harms to the immediate public waters of Wisconsin, and complete an EIS before any other permitting can proceed. **We will hold the WI DNR accountable and encourage you, who are supposed to be representing us, to do your jobs and do so as well.** Thank you very much.

**John D. and Mary Lou Garnett,  
N246 3<sup>rd</sup> Court  
Pleasant Lake, WI**

If you do not wish to receive email communications from New York Life, please reply to this email, using the word "Opt out" in the subject line.

Please copy [email\\_optout@newyorklife.com](mailto:email_optout@newyorklife.com)

New York Life Insurance Company, 51 Madison Ave, New York, NY 10010

**From:** [Jamie O'Hearn](#)  
**To:** [Greve, Rachel M - DNR](#)  
**Subject:** Proposed High Capacity Wells at Richfield Dairy  
**Date:** Sunday, January 06, 2013 9:35:07 AM

---

Ms. Greve,

I want to express my deep concern regarding the proposed high-capacity wells for the Richfield Dairy.

I am specifically concerned with the impact the wells will have on Little Roche a Cri Creek, Fordham Creek, Chaffee Creek, and TagatzCreek as well as Pleasant Lake. I am troubled by the potential impact to Little Roche a Cri and Fordham Creeks which are both Exceptional Resource Waters, and Chaffee and Tagatz Creeks which are Outstanding Resource Waters. The wells also will have a detrimental effect on Pleasant Lake which has already been experiencing very low water levels for several consecutive years most likely as a result of the many high capacity wells in the Central Sands. The impact to the wetlands NW of the site is also of concern.

Studies have shown impact to these waters at the original pumping request of 52 MGY and yet the DNR states that no *significant* impact would occur based on a higher amount of 72 MGY. This is not logical. In light of all other evidence, and in combination of the many other wells in the area, *significant* is a matter of interpretation. As an individual who enjoys the use of these waters, these impacts are in fact significant!

While the DNR acknowledges the impact to these areas due to the large number of high capacity wells already in existence, the agency's position of ignoring these cumulative impacts is one of profound disappointment. I urge the DNR to more thoroughly address cumulative impacts; this region is located in the middle of highly intensive irrigated agriculture. Studies have shown that high-capacity wells in the region have led to reductions in water quantity in the Central Sands region of the state.

I urge the DNR to deny the application for high capacity well(s) based on probable significant adverse environmental impacts to waters of the state that cannot be avoided by placing conditions on the construction or use of the well(s).

Sincerely,

James O'Hearn

[johearn34@gmail.com](mailto:johearn34@gmail.com)

708-638-6323